MNRAS 000, 1–6 (2016) Preprint 12 December 2016 Compiled using MNRAS LATEX style file v3.0

How much a galaxy knows about its large-scale environment?: An information theoretic perspective

Biswajit Pandey* and Suman Sarkar†
Department of Physics, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, Birbhum, 731235, India

arXiv:1611.00283v2 [astro-ph.CO] 9 Dec 2016

12 December 2016

ABSTRACT

The small-scale environment characterized by the local density is known to play a crucial role in deciding the galaxy properties but the role of large-scale environment on galaxy formation and evolution still remain a less clear issue. We propose an information theoretic framework to investigate the influence of large-scale environment on galaxy properties and apply it to the data from the Galaxy Zoo project which provides the visual morphological classifications of ~ 1 million galaxies from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey. We find a non-zero mutual information between morphology and environment which decreases with increasing length scales but persists throughout the entire length scales probed. We estimate the conditional mutual information and the interaction information between morphology and environment by conditioning the environment on different length scales and find a synergic interaction between them which operates upto at least a length scales of $\sim 30\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. Our analysis indicates that these interactions largely arise due to the mutual information shared between the environments on different length scales.

Key words: methods: statistical - data analysis - galaxies: formation - evolution - cosmology: large scale structure of the Universe.

1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding the formation and evolution of galaxies is one of the most challenging problems in cosmology. It is now quite well known that the galaxy properties depend on the environment. The elliptical galaxies are known to preferentially reside in rich clusters whereas the spiral galaxies are mostly distributed in the fields (Hubble 1936; Zwicky 1968; Dressler 1980). Analysis of the two-point correlation function of galaxies (Willmer, da Costa, & Pellegrini 1998; Brown, Webstar, & Boyle 2000; Zehavi et al. 2005) also suggests that the ellipticals are strongly clustered as compared to the spirals. The genus statistics of the red galaxies which are predominantly ellipticals show a shift towards a meatball topology (Hoyle et al. 2002; Park et al. 2005) indicating their preference for the high density environments. A study of the filamentarity of the galaxy distribution (Pandey & Bharadwaj 2006) in the SDSS DR1 indicates that the ellipticals preferentially inhabit the nodes where the filaments intersect whereas the spirals are sparsely distributed along the filaments. Besides morphology, many other galaxy properties such as luminosity, colour, star formation rate, star formation history, stellar mass, size, metallicity and AGN activity are known to strongly depend on the environment (Davis & Geller 1976; Guzzo et al. 1997; Zehavi et al. 2002; Goto et al. 2003; Hogg et al. 2003; Blanton et al. 2003; Einasto et al. 2003; Kauffmann et al. 2004; Mouhcine et al. 2007; Bamford et al. 2009; Koyama et al. 2013).

In the current paradigm, the dark matter first collapses hierarchically into halos and the baryons settle down later at the centres of these halos to form galaxies by cooling and condensation (White & Rees 1978). In the halo model (Neyman & Scott 1952; Mo & White 1996; Ma & Fry 2000; Seljak 2000; Scoccimarro & Sheth 2001; Cooray & Sheth 2002; Berlind & Weinberg 2002; Yang, Mo & van den Bosch 2003), all galaxies are believed to form and reside in virialized dark matter halos. The halo model postulates that the number and type of galaxies residing in a dark matter halo are entirely determined by its mass. If these halos evolve in isolation, the galaxy properties are largely determined at birth by the initial conditions at the locations where they formed. But in the hierarchical model, smaller halos merge to form bigger halos and the galaxy properties evolve according to the nature of their

* E-mail: biswap@visva-bharati.ac.in
† E-mail:sumansarkar.rs@visva-bharati.ac.in

© 2016 The Authors

mergers. The environmental effects such as ram pressure striping and different types of galaxy-galaxy interactions are thus expected to play a crucial role in the formation and evolution of galaxies.

Traditionally, the environment of a galaxy is characterized by the local density which describes the neighbourhood of the host halo where the galaxy is embedded. However the host halos themselves may be embedded in filaments, sheets or clusters and many of the properties of the host halos such as their masses, shapes and spins are determined by their large-scale cosmic environment (Hahn et al. 2007). So in principle the large-scale environment can indirectly influence the properties of the galaxies. Using SDSS DR7 data, Luparello et al. (2015) find a significant dependence of the properties of late type brightest group galaxies on their large-scale environment. A study of the star formation rates in compact groups from the SDSS DR7 (Scudder et al. 2012) find significant difference in the star formation rates between isolated groups and the groups which are embedded in superstructures. Pandey & Bharadwaj (2008) analyzed the filamentarity of the galaxy distribution from the SDSS DR5 and find that the average filamentarity of the star forming galaxies are higher than the red galaxies. Darvish et al. (2014) find that the presence of filamentary environment elevates the fraction of star forming galaxies in the past at redshift $z \sim 1$. Filho et al. (2015) find that $\sim 75\%$ of the extremely metal poor galaxies reside in sheets and voids. Park & Choi (2009) analyzed the galaxies from the SDSS DR4 to find that the role of the large-scale density in determining galaxy properties is minimal once luminosity and morphology are fixed. Yan, Fan & White (2013) find no dependence of the galaxy properties on the tidal environment of large scale structures in the SDSS DR7. At present, the roles of the large-scale environment in determining the galaxy properties are less clear and there is no consensus on this issue.

In this Letter we propose an information theoretic framework to study the dependence of the galaxy properties on the large-scale environment. We apply this method to the Galaxy Zoo project (Lintott et al. 2008, 2011) to investigate if there is any correlation between the galaxy morphology and the large-scale environment. More than 200,000 volunteers in the internet participated in this project and classified ~ 1 million galaxies according to their morphology by visual inspection. The morphological classification by direct visual inspection avoids many of the potential biases associated with the proxies for morphology. Thus the Galaxy Zoo provides an unique opportunity to test the large scale environmental dependence of the morphology of the galaxies. The method proposed here can be also applied to test the large scale environmental dependence of any other galaxy properties.

A brief outline of the Letter follows. In section 2 we describe the method of analysis followed by a description of the data in section 3. We present the results and conclusions in section 4.

2 METHOD OF ANALYSIS

We construct a galaxy sample in a cubic region containing N galaxies with known morphology. We divide the cubic region into $d\,h^{-1}$ Mpc $\times$ $d\,h^{-1}$ Mpc $\times$ $d\,h^{-1}$ Mpc three dimensional rectangular grids. The entire sample is now divided into a number of regular cubic voxels of grid size $d\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. Let N_d be the number of resulting voxels for a grid size of d. Our sample consists only the spiral and the elliptical galaxies and does not include the galaxies with uncertain morphology. One can count the number of different types of galaxies in each of the N_d voxels for grid size d. Let $(n_s)_i$ and $(n_e)_i$ respectively be the number of spiral and elliptical galaxies residing in the i^{th} voxel then $n_i = (n_s)_i + (n_e)_i$ is the total number of galaxies in the i^{th} voxel. Summing over all the N_d voxels gives $\sum_{i=1}^{N_d}(n_s)_i = N_s$, $\sum_{i=1}^{N_d}(n_e)_i = N_e$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N_d} n_i = N$ where N_s, N_e and N are the total number of spirals, total number of ellipticals and the total number of galaxies in the sample respectively. We define two discrete random variables X and Y with probability distributions $P(X)$ and $P(Y)$ respectively. $P(X_i) = \frac{n_i}{N}$ is the probability that a randomly drawn galaxy resides in the i^{th} voxel. $P(X)$ has a total N_d outcomes. $P(Y_j)$ is the probability that a randomly chosen galaxy is spiral or elliptical and it has 2 outcomes given by $P(Y_1) = \frac{N_s}{N}$ for spiral and $P(Y_2) = \frac{N_e}{N}$ for elliptical. We vary the grid size d within a suitable range and estimate the probability distributions $P(X)$ in each case. It may be noted here that we consider a cubic region for our analysis as it allows us to use the entire sample while dividing it into different number of rectangular voxels for different grid sizes and keep the total number of galaxies same in each case.

2.1 The mutual information between morphology and environment

In information theory, the information entropy $H(x)$ (Shannon 1948) is the average amount of information required to describe a random variable x and is defined as,

$$H(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} p(x_i)\,\log\,p(x_i) \quad (1)$$

where $p(x_i)$ is the probability of i^{th} outcome and m is the total number of outcome. Here the base of the logarithm is arbitrary and we chose it to be 10 for the present work.

For the pair of random variables (X, Y) with joint probability distribution $P(X, Y)$ the joint entropy $H(X, Y)$ is defined as,

$$H(X,Y) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_d}\sum_{j=1}^{2} P(X_i, Y_j)\,\log\,P(X_i, Y_j) \quad (2)$$

Here X and Y are the random variables introduced earlier. The joint probability that a randomly selected galaxy resides in the i^{th} voxel and is spiral or elliptical is given by $P(X, Y) = P(Y|X)P(X)$ where $P(Y|X)$ is the conditional probability that the randomly selected galaxy is spiral or elliptical given that it resides in the i^{th} voxel. This gives $P(X_i, Y_j) = \frac{(n_s)_i}{N}$ for $j = 1$ (spiral) and $P(X_i, Y_j) = \frac{(n_e)_i}{N}$ for $j = 2$ (elliptical).

The mutual information $I(X;Y)$ between X and Y is then defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} I(X;Y) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_d}\sum_{j=1}^{2} P(X_i, Y_j)\,\log\,\frac{P(X_i, Y_j)}{P(X_i)P(Y_j)} \quad (3)\\ &= H(X) + H(Y) - H(X,Y) \end{aligned}$$

where $H(X)$ and $H(Y)$ are the individual entropies associated with the variable X and Y respectively. $I(X;Y) \geq 0$ as $H(X,Y) \leq H(X) + H(Y)$ with equality only if the random variables X and Y are independent. The mutual information is also symmetric in X and Y i.e. $H(X,Y) = H(Y,X)$. It should be noted that $I(X;X) = H(X)$ provides the self information. We vary the grid size and estimate $I(X;Y)$ in each case.

The mutual information measures how much one random variable tells us about another. It can be thought of as the reduction in uncertainty about one random variable given the knowledge of another. A high value of mutual information corresponds to large reduction in uncertainty and low value indicates a small reduction in it. A zero mutual information indicates that the two random variables are independent.

2.2 The mutual information between environments on different scales

We also estimate the mutual information between the environments on different length scales. We define another random variable $\bar{X}$ analogous to X which characterizes the environment of the galaxy on an another scale. The mutual information between environments on different length scales $I(X;\bar{X})$ is similarly defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} I(X;\bar{X}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_{d_1}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{d_2}} P(X_i,\bar{X}_k) \log \frac{P(X_i,\bar{X}_k)}{P(X_i)P(\bar{X}_k)} \\ &= H(X) + H(\bar{X}) - H(X,\bar{X}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

N_{d_1} and N_{d_2} are the the number of voxels for grid sizes d_1 and d_2 respectively. The joint probability $P(X_i,\bar{X}_k) = \frac{n_{ik}}{N}$, where n_{ik} is the number of galaxies shared by the i^{th} voxel of grid size d_1 and k^{th} voxel of grid size d_2. The joint entropy $H(X,\bar{X})$ is similarly defined as,

$$H(X,\bar{X}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_{d_1}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{d_2}} P(X_i,\bar{X}_k) \log P(X_i,\bar{X}_k) \quad (5)$$

We vary the grid size and estimate $I(X;\bar{X})$ for each choice of $(X,\bar{X})$.

2.3 The conditional mutual information between morphology and environment

A positive mutual information between morphology and environment does not necessarily imply a causal dependence of morphology on environment. The mutual information between morphology and environment may come from the shared mutual information between different environmental properties such as the environments on different scales. To investigate this further, we calculate the conditional mutual information between the morphology and environment.

The conditional mutual information provides the expected value of the mutual information between two random variables given that we have the knowledge of a third random variable. In particular here we are interested in the mutual information between galaxy morphology and the environment on a particular scale given that we have the knowledge of the environment of the galaxy on a different scale. The conditional mutual information between X and Y given the value of $\bar{X}$ is defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} I(X;Y|\bar{X}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_{d_1}} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{d_2}} P(X_i,Y_j,\bar{X}_k) \log \frac{P(\bar{X}_k)P(X_i,Y_j,\bar{X}_k)}{P(X_i,\bar{X}_k)P(Y_j,\bar{X}_k)} \\ &= H(X,\bar{X}) + H(Y,\bar{X}) - H(X,Y,\bar{X}) - H(\bar{X}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Applying the chain rule of probability one can write the joint probability $P(X_i,Y_j,\bar{X}_k) = P(\bar{X}_k|Y_j,X_i)P(Y_j|X_i)P(X_i)$ which will be $\frac{(n_s)_{ik}}{N}$ for $j=1$ and $\frac{(n_e)_{ik}}{N}$ for $j=2$. $(n_s)_{ik}$ and $(n_e)_{ik}$ are respectively the numbers of spirals and ellipticals shared by the i^{th} voxel of size d_1 and k^{th} voxel of size d_2. The joint entropy $H(X,Y,\bar{X})$ is defined as,

$$H(X,Y,\bar{X}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_{d_1}} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{d_2}} P(X_i,Y_j,\bar{X}_k) \log P(X_i,Y_j,\bar{X}_k) \quad (7)$$

The conditional mutual information is always non-negative. It is zero only when the correlation between X and Y is entirely due to the influence of $\bar{X}$. We vary the grid size and estimate $I(X;Y|\bar{X})$ for each choice of $(X,\bar{X})$.

2.4 The interaction information between morphology and environment

One can define the interaction information (McGill 1954) as,

$$I(X;Y;\bar{X}) = I(X;Y|\bar{X}) - I(X;Y) \quad (8)$$

which measures the loss or gain in information between X and Y due to the additional knowledge of the third random variable $\bar{X}$. Conditioning on $\bar{X}$ may increase, decrease or not change the mutual information between X and Y. Consequently, $I(X;Y;\bar{X})$ may be positive, negative or zero. $I(X;Y;\bar{X}) < 0$ indicates that conditioning on $\bar{X}$ weakens the correlation between X and Y whereas $I(X;Y;\bar{X}) > 0$ indicates that $\bar{X}$ enhances the correlation between X and Y. If conditioning on $\bar{X}$ does not affect the mutual information between X and Y then $I(X;Y;\bar{X}) = 0$.

We have used a ΛCDM cosmological model with $\Omega_{m0} = 0.31$, $\Omega_{\Lambda 0} = 0.69$ and $h = 1$ throughout.

3 DATA: THE GALAXY ZOO SAMPLE

The Galaxy Zoo (Lintott et al. 2008, 2011) data can be directly accessed from the SDSS DR12 SkyServer database. We download the data from the SDSS DR12 database using a Structured Query Language (SQL) search. We identify a contiguous region spanning $135^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 225^\circ$ and $0^\circ \leq \delta \leq 60^\circ$ where α and δ are the right ascension and declination respectively. We extract all the galaxies in this contiguous region which lies in the redshift range $0 \leq z \leq 0.25$ and are brighter than a limiting r-band Petrosian magnitude 17.77. These cuts produce a sample with 343340 galaxies of which 134745 are classified. We only consider the classified galaxies with a debiased vote fraction > 0.8. We construct a volume limited sample by restricting the extinction corrected and k-corrected r-band absolute magnitude


Mutual Information I(X;Y)
Grid size for X (Mpc/h)
Interaction information (I(X;Y;X̄))
11.0 h-1 Mpc
18.3 h-1 Mpc
33.0 h-1 Mpc
55.0 h-1 Mpc
82.5 h-1 Mpc
Grid size for X̄ (Mpc/h)
11.0 15.0 16.5 18.3 23.6 33.0 41.3 55.0 82.5
Grid size for X (Mpc/h)
0.5 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5
Mutual Information (I(X;X̄))
-0.04 -0.02 0 0.02 0.04 0.06
Interaction information (I(X;Y;X̄))

Figure 1. The top left panel shows the mutual information between morphology (Y) and environment (X) as a function of length scales. The top right panel shows the magnitudes of interaction information between morphology (Y) and environment (X) as a function of length scales when the environment is conditioned at different scales ($\bar{X}$) as indicated in the panel. The 1σ errorbars shown in the top two panels are obtained from 10 jackknife subsamples drawn from the SDSS data. The interaction information is shown again for all possible combinations of $X, \bar{X}$ in the bottom right panel. The bottom left panel shows the mutual information between the environments on different scales (X and $\bar{X}$).

to $M_r < -20$. The resulting volume limited sample extends upto a redshift $z = 0.1067$ and consists of 42334 galaxies with visual morphological classification. It may be noted here that we have only considered the galaxies which are visually classified as spiral or elliptical and discarded all the galaxies with uncertain morphology. Finally from this volume limited sample we extract a cubic region with sides $165\,h^{-1}$ Mpc which contain a total 15860 galaxies out of which 11875 are spirals and 3985 are ellipticals.

4 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

We show the mutual information $I(X;Y)$ between the morphology and environment of galaxies as a function of length scales in the top left panel of figure Figure 1. It shows the presence of a non-zero mutual information between morphology and environment which decreases with increasing length scales but persists throughout the entire length scales probed. The 1σ errorbars shown here are obtained using 10 jackknife subsamples drawn from the data. It is important to understand the origin of this non-zero mutual information between morphology and environment. To investigate this further, we compute the conditional mutual information $I(X;Y|\bar{X})$ between morphology and environment at each length scales by conditioning the environment at other length scales. The mutual and the conditional mutual information were then used to calculate the interaction information $I(X;Y;\bar{X})$ shown in the bottom right panel of Figure 1. We find that conditioning the environment on $11\,h^{-1}$ Mpc leads to a positive interaction between morphology and environment at all the other scales. As we condition the environment on successively larger scales we observe the same trend upto $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. The interaction information becomes negative at all length scales when the environment is conditioned on scales beyond $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. It may be noted that all the diagonal boxes exhibit negative interactions. Conditioning the environment on the same scale where the interaction is measured would give $I(X;Y|\bar{X}) = 0$ leading to a negative interaction information. In the top right panel of Figure 1 we again separately show the magnitudes of the interaction

information at each length scale when the environment is conditioned at different scales. This again clearly shows that the degree of positive interaction between the morphology (Y) and environment (X) decreases with an increase in the scale at which the environment ($\bar{X}$) is conditioned. The interaction information diminishes nearly to 0 when the environment ($\bar{X}$) is conditioned at $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. The 1σ errorbars in each case are obtained by jackknife resampling. The size of the errorbars indicate that the interaction information are quite distinct when the conditioning is done at a length scale below $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. As noted earlier, a further increase in the scale for conditioning $\bar{X}$ leads to a negative interaction between the morphology and environment on all scales. It may be noted that the grid sizes for X and $\bar{X}$ are decided by the choice of the number of grids used to divide the cubic region.

A positive interaction information imply 'synergy' and a negative interaction information imply 'redundancy' in the interaction between the random variables (McGill 1954). So a positive interaction between X and Y given the knowledge of $\bar{X}$ indicates that when $\bar{X}$ is known, the knowledge of X provides additional information on Y than that provided by X and $\bar{X}$ individually. On the other hand, a negative interaction between X and Y given the knowledge of $\bar{X}$ tells us that when $\bar{X}$ is known, the knowledge of X does not tell us anything new about Y. Conditioning $\bar{X}$ upto a length scales of $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc introduces positive interaction between X and Y on larger scales and negative interaction on smaller scales. This indicates that conditioning the environment on a particular scale plays an important role in the apparent interaction between morphology and environment. The fact that the interaction between X and Y becomes negative on all scales when $\bar{X}$ is conditioned on a scale beyond $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc suggests that no information is shared between morphology and environment beyond this length scale. Further the mutual information between X and Y on scales below $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc does not arise due to a causal interaction between them. Rather they are the outcome of a non-zero mutual information between the environments on different scales. Equation 4 and Equation 6 together suggest that a larger mutual information between the environments on different scales would produce a smaller conditional mutual information between X and Y given $\bar{X}$. Consequently the interaction information $I(X;Y;\bar{X})$ would reduce when both $I(X;\bar{X})$ and $I(X;Y)$ are larger and enhance when $I(X;\bar{X})$ is larger but $I(X;Y)$ is smaller. In the bottom left panel of Figure 1 we show the mutual information $I(X,\bar{X})$ shared by the environments on different scales. It is interesting to note that the mutual information between X and $\bar{X}$ are much larger than the mutual information between X and Y on each scale. Furthermore the mutual information between X and $\bar{X}$ decreases with increasing length scales and reduces by more than a factor of half beyond a scale of $33\,h^{-1}$ Mpc. Combining these results we conclude that the observed apparent interaction between morphology and environment of a galaxy are most likely caused by the shared mutual information between the environments on different scales and they cease to exist beyond a length scales of $\sim 30\,h^{-1}$ Mpc.

Finally we note that the method presented here provides an effective avenue to explore the large scale environmental dependence of galaxy properties from a new perspective. In future, we plan to carry out a detail study of the large scale environmental dependence of a number of other galaxy properties using the SDSS (York et al. 2000). Such a study will clearly reveal any influence of the large-scale environment on the other galaxy properties and their evolution.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank the Galaxy Zoo team for making the data public. The authors thank an anonymous referee for useful comments on the paper. B.P. would like to acknowledge financial support from the SERB, DST, Government of India through the project EMR/2015/001037. B.P. would also like to acknowledge IUCAA, Pune and CTS, IIT, Kharagpur for providing support through associateship and visitors programme respectively. S.S. thanks Chris J. Lintott for his help in understanding the Galaxy Zoo data. S.S. would also like to thank UGC, Government of India for providing financial support through a Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship.

REFERENCES

Berlind, A., Weinberg, D.H. 2002, ApJ, 575, 587
Bamford, S. P., Nichol, R. C., Baldry, I. K., et al. 2009, MNRAS, 393, 1324
Blanton, M. R., et al. 2003, ApJ, 594, 186
Brown, M.J.I., Webstar, R.L., & Boyle, B.J., 2000, MNRAS,317, 782
Corray, A., Sheth, R.K., 2002, Phys. Rep., 371, 1
Davis, M., & Geller, M.J., 1976, ApJ, 208, 13
Darvish, B., Sobral, D., Mobasher, B., et al. 2014, ApJ, 796, 51
Dressler, A., 1980, ApJ, 236, 351
Einasto, J., Hütsi, G., Einasto, M., Saar, E., Tucker, D. L., Müller, V., Heinämäki, P., & Allam, S. S. 2003, A&A, 405, 425
Filho, M. E., Sánchez Almeida, J., Muñoz-Tuñón, C., et al. 2015, ApJ, 802, 82
Goto, T., Yamauchi, C., Fujita, Y., Okamura, S., Seikiguchi, M., Smail, I. Bernardi, M., & Gomez, P.L., 2003, MNRAS, 346, 601
Guzzo, L., Strauss, M.A., Fisher, K.B., Giovanelli, R., & Haynes, M.P., 1997, ApJ, 489, 37
Hahn, O., Porciani, C., Carollo, C. M., & Dekel, A. 2007, MNRAS, 375, 489
Hogg, D. W., et al. 2003, ApJ Letters, 585, L5
Hoyle, F., et al. 2002, ApJ, 580, 663
Hubble, E.P., 1936, The Realm of the Nebulae (Oxford University Press: Oxford), 79
Jung, I., Lee, J., & Yi, S. K. 2014, ApJ, 794, 74
Kauffmann, G., White, S. D. M., Heckman, T. M., et al. 2004, MNRAS, 353, 713
Koyama, Y., Smail, I., Kurk, J., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 423
Lintott, C. J., Schawinski, K., Slosar, A., et al. 2008, MNRAS, 389, 1179
Lintott, C., Schawinski, K., Bamford, S., et al. 2011, MNRAS, 410, 166
Luparello, H. E., Lares, M., Paz, D., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 448, 1483
Ma, C.P., Fry, J.N. 2000, ApJ, 543, 503
McGill, W. J. 1954, Psychometrika, 19, 97
Mo, H. J., & White, S. D. M. 1996, MNRAS, 282, 347
Mouhcine, M., Baldry, I. K., & Bamford, S. P. 2007, MNRAS, 382, 801
Neyman, J., & Scott, E. L. 1952, ApJ, 116, 144

Pandey, B., & Bharadwaj, S. 2006, MNRAS, 372, 827
Pandey, B., & Bharadwaj, S. 2008, MNRAS, 387, 767
Park, C., et al. 2005, ApJ, 633, 11
Park, C., & Choi, Y.-Y. 2009, ApJ, 691, 1828
Scoccimarro, R., Sheth, R. 2001, ApJ, 329, 629
Scudder, J. M., Ellison, S. L., & Mendel, J. T. 2012, MNRAS, 423, 2690
Seljak, U. 2000, MNRAS, 318, 203
Shannon, C. E. 1948, Bell System Technical Journal, 27, 379-423, 623-656
Willmer, C.N.A., da Costa, L.N., & Pellegrini, P.S., 1998, AJ, 115, 869
White, S. D. M., & Rees, M. J. 1978, MNRAS, 183, 341
Yan, H., Fan, Z., White, S. D. M. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 3432
Yang, X., Mo, H.J., van den Bosch, F.C. 2003, MNRAS, 339, 1057
York, D. G., et al. 2000, AJ, 120, 1579
Zehavi, I., et al. 2002, ApJ,571,172
Zehavi, I., et al. 2005, ApJ, 630, 1
Zwicky, F., Herzog, E., Wild, P., Karpowicz, M., & Kowal, C., 1961-1968, Catalog of Galaxies and Clusters of Galaxies, vols. 1-6 (Pasadena: California Institute of Technology)

This paper has been typeset from a TEX/LATEX file prepared by the author.